

(14)

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT
BILASPUR**

W.P. No. 1233 Of 2006.

PETITIONER'S

P.R. No. 1295/06
Presented by Shri J. S. Gupta
dated 2/3/06

RECEIVED-COPY
7/5/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

- :- 1. D.K. Dubey, son of Shri R.G. Dubey,
Aged about 56 years, resident of
Old Sarkanda (Shivghat), Bilaspur
(Chhattisgarh),
2. S.K. Gupta, son of Late M.L. Gupta,
aged about 44 years, resident of Shiv
Mandir Road, Mangla Naka Chowk,
Kududand, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh),
3. S.K. Pandey, son of Shri B.P. Pandey,
aged about 53 years, resident of R.T.S.
Colony, Qr. No. 535, Bilaspur (C.G.),
4. M.S. Rajput, son of G.S. Rajput, aged
about 54 years, resident of Village at
P.O. Janji, Tahsil Masturi, District
Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh).

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS

- :-1. Collector, Collectorate, Mungeli Road,
Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh),
2. Engineer-In-Chief, Public Works
Department, Raipur (Chhattisgarh),
3. Chief Engineer, Public Works
Department, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh),
4. Executive Engineer, Public Works
Department, Division No. 1, Bilaspur
(Chhattisgarh).



PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(69)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 1233 of 2006

Petitioner	Versus	D. K. Dubey and others
Respondents		Collector and others

Single Bench : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri.

Shri H. B. Agarwal, Senior Advocate with Miss Sangeta Mishra,
Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Satish Gupta, Deputy Government Advocate for the
Respondents.

ORAL ORDER

(25th March, 2006)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The petitioners are employed as Assistant Grade-III and working in the same capacity in Accounts Section at Public Works Department, Bilaspur. According to the petitioners, the Chief Engineer (Planning) in the office of the Engineer-In-Chief issued a circular to all the Chief Engineers on 6.12.2005 (Annexure P/1) with a direction that the Senior Accounts Clerks, Sub-divisional Clerks, Store Keepers, Auditors and Budget Clerks should not be allowed to work on one seat for more than three years.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioners have made a representation to the authorities on 3.10.2005 (Annexure P/11) but the authorities have not yet responded. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at this stage, confines his submission to consideration of the representation made by the petitioners by the

70

authorities within the stipulated time. Learned counsel for the respondents has no objection to this submission.

3. Accordingly, the respondents are directed to consider and decide the representation dated 3.10.2005 (Annexure P/11) filed by the petitioner, in accordance with law, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.
4. In view of the foregoing, the petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Certified copy, as per Rules.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur